UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/47/PV.31
22 October 1992

ENGLISH

Forty-seventh session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 9 October 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. GANEV (Bulgaria)
(President)

- Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the organization: reports of the Secretary-General [10]

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

92-61388 1737V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 10

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/47/1, A/47/277)

The PRESIDENT: This morning the General Assembly will consider agenda item 10, entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization" (A/47/1), including the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace - preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping" (A/47/277).

It is my hope that we shall have an energetic, creative and fruitful discussion fully realizing the potential of this item and of this forum, the General Assembly.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): I should like to begin by simply saying how much the European Community and its member States, on whose behalf I am speaking, welcome the initiative that you, Sir, as President have taken to have two days of debate on this particular issue, that is to say, the follow-up - in our view the action-oriented follow-up - required to the Secretary-General's report on "An Agenda for Peace".

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

We welcome the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization (A/47/1) in general, his wider report, and I should say at the outset that we are encouraged by the commitment he has made to restructuring the Secretariat. We also welcome the Secretary-General's emphasis on the work of the United Nations in the fields of economic and social development as well as those of peace and security. But in this statement this morning I intend to focus on his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

As Mr Douglas Hurd, the Foreign Secretary, speaking on behalf of the European Community, said in the general debate, the Community and its member States warmly welcome the Secretary-General's report and thank him and his staff for all their efforts in preparing it. We attach importance to the request for the report, which was made in the presidential statement that was agreed at the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January. The European Community and its member States submitted an informal contribution to the Secretary-General while the report was being prepared and we were encouraged by how much common ground there was between the contribution we made and the eventual report.

The Secretary-General's report is a comprehensive step towards strengthening the United Nations. It is wide-ranging and contains a wealth of interesting ideas. We welcome the widest possible discussion of them. We listened with interest to the preliminary views of delegations expressed in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations in August and to the views expressed by those Heads of State and Government and Foreign Ministers who participated in the general debate which has just finished. We are pleased that the Security Council has carried out some preliminary work to identify

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

those parts of the Secretary-General's report which are of interest to it and we look forward to that work progressing in as action-oriented a way as the work in the Assembly.

On preventive diplomacy first: it is a statement of the obvious that preventive diplomacy is more useful to people about to be embroiled in conflict than the most successful peace-keeping or peacemaking operation. It is less costly in terms of lives and cash and we therefore believe that the Secretary-General should be ready to make full use of his powers under Article 99 of the Charter to draw the attention of the Security Council to any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security. To do so the Secretary-General should make full use of the Secretariat's information-gathering capabilities and seek to improve them. The Secretariat should continue to gather and evaluate all relevant information originating from all parts of the United Nations system around the world and from Member States. In this regard we are in favour of confidence-building measures and endorse the greater use of fact-finding missions as proposed in the Secretary-General's report and as practised by the Secretary-General in recent weeks. We recall the Assembly's declaration last year on fact-finding, which was initiated by members of the European Community. The recent fact-finding missions to Moldova, Nagorno-Karabakh, Tajikstan and Georgia have already made a valuable contribution. But one has to recognize the fact that the success of preventive diplomacy depends also on the political will of the parties involved or about to be involved in a conflict.

The Secretary-General suggests that the time has come to consider preventive deployments of troops when so requested, to deter aggression or

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

conflict between States, possibly involving deployment to only one side of an international boundary. There may be timing and other difficulties about the dispatch of such a force in a given crisis, but essentially we believe that this is a sound idea which should be followed up on a case-by-case basis. In some cases it may also be useful to establish a demilitarized zone with the consent of the parties as a preventive measure in advance of a risk of conflict.

We also see merit in the idea of preventive deployment in the event of an internal crisis, when help with humanitarian assistance or conciliation is requested. The failure to take such measures in the cases of Somalia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are clear cases that remind us of the need for such preventive action. Of course no two cases would be the same. Before any deployment there would need to be careful discussion with the Governments and parties concerned. Recognizing that, the European Community and its member States have already decided in principle to send civilian monitoring missions to States which want them - where this would help to avert a crisis and possible bloodshed. In South Africa with the agreement of all parties, the United Nations, the European Community and the Commonwealth are all sending observers to reinforce the domestic peace mechanism.

I should like now to speak a little about peacemaking. The European Community and its member States believe that, as the Secretary-General suggests, the United Nations should put an increased effort into peacemaking by taking advantage of the provisions of the Charter for dispute settlement. In this regard, the European Community and its member States fully share the observation of the Secretary-General that the Security Council may, under

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

Articles 36 and 37 of the Charter, recommend to Member States the submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice, or arbitration, or other dispute-settlement mechanisms.

In connection with Article 50 of the Charter, we are acutely aware of the economic difficulties often caused to third countries by the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII. Countries which need balance-of-payments help and which are also implementing prudent adjustment programmes are being adversely affected. The international financial institutions are well placed to assess and then take into account the effects of United Nations mandatory sanctions when they design support packages for these countries. This question is also currently being examined in the Charter Committee and we look forward to contributing constructively to the outcome.

The Secretary-General's report contains a number of proposals for Member States to earmark forces for enforcement action and for peace-keeping. One member of the European Community has already offered to make 1000 troops available at 48 hours' notice and another 1000 within one week.

On peace-keeping: so far as peace-keeping operations are concerned the member countries of the European Community are currently providing more than 14,000 peace-keepers and this will increase with the deployment of the second part of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. All the Twelve have responded to the Secretary-General's questionnaire on forces that could be made available for peace-keeping operations and all member States will keep this under regular review. The Twelve believe it would also be useful if the Secretariat could update the questionnaire and issue a similar one on civilian police and other civilian

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

personnel who might be made available for peace-keeping operations. There should be, in our view, must greater contact between the military and defence establishments of Member States and the Secretariat to clarify what support might be needed and what might be available, to pave the way for possible future agreements between the United Nations and individual Member States. The Twelve therefore stand ready to make troops available for peace-keeping operations.

The European Community and its member States recall that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has made interesting recommendations which have been adopted by the General Assembly in recent years. Many of these have concerned training for United Nations peace-keepers. Like the Secretary-General, we are keen to see improved training for peace-keeping personnel. We welcome the strengthening of the Department of Peace-keeping Affairs and the proposed augmentation of the strength and capability of the Military Adviser's office. Given the increasing role of civilian police in peace-keeping operations, consideration should be given to the appointment of a Senior Police Adviser to the Secretary-General. We also commend the idea in the Secretary-General's report that Governments should keep appropriate equipment on stand-by for use by the United Nations. This should help ease the problems that often arise in the early phases of the deployment of a peace-keeping operation.

The role of the United Nations does not stop once a conflict is over. The Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" rightly looks at how we might help in peace-building after a conflict. The United Nations is making a crucial contribution, for example in El Salvador, in Angola and in Cambodia,

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

and we look forward to its being able to do so very soon in Mozambique. The promotion of free elections and democratic institutions is a key part of such peace-building and a proper area of activity for the United Nations. So, at a practical level, is the removal of mines. It is a stern commentary on the state of the world that the removal of mines in the aftermath of conflict is so high on our agenda, and must be so. In Cambodia, Afghanistan, Somalia and Angola this problem is a dramatic one. We therefore welcome the appointment of a de-mining expert on the Military Adviser's staff.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

Clearly, the fostering of sound economic and social development in areas torn by conflict is an essential part of reconstruction and peace- building. Equally, as the Secretary-General says, good governance must be promoted. The absence of democratic and pluralistic internal structures is a source of political and economic instability which may well result in a threat to international peace and security. The exercise of sovereignty involves internal and external responsibilities. Sovereignty cannot be used as a general cover for systematic human-rights violations, in particular when such violations take the form of internal repression and threaten international peace and stability. The European Community and its member States have underlined that all Governments are accountable to the international community for the observance of those obligations they have freely assumed. There cannot be arguments about interference in their internal affairs to avoid criticism for failure to meet those international obligations.

The European Community and its member States welcome the emphasis the Secretary-General gives to human rights, democracy and development. We want the World Conference on Human Rights at Vienna in June 1993 to take real steps to achieve this. It could support and reinforce efforts of individual countries to promote democracy, respect for human rights and accountability at all levels. We also look forward to the adoption of the declaration on the rights of persons belonging to minorities at this session of the General Assembly.

The European Community and its member States warmly welcome the tide of political reform now flowing in many parts of the world. We are playing

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

our part in furthering this. Europe, both at the national and the Community level, has already shown its readiness to respond to requests for assistance in election-monitoring in a number of countries.

We have noted that a major theme in the Secretary-General's report is the role that can be played by regional organizations in problems of international peace and security. We commend this idea. In many situations a bigger and more effective role can be played by the relevant regional organizations in coordination with the United Nations. We welcome the increasing trend for regional organizations to do more in respect of both peace-keeping and peacemaking, and we look forward to the continued development of this trend. We hope that in the future the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) will be effective in the prevention of conflict throughout Europe. With the adoption of the Helsinki Document the CSCE has begun to give itself the tools to tackle problems by conciliation and arbitration before they slide into violence, and to manage crises once they develop; this includes the possibility of CSCE peace-keeping operations. The Helsinski Document adopted in July recognizes that the CSCE is a regional arrangement, according to Chapter VIII of the Charter, and thus provides an important link between European and global security.

The European Community Monitoring Mission is soon to extend its activities beyond the former Yugoslavia to the borders between the former Yugoslavia and Hungary, Bulgaria and Albania. In our view this is precisely the sort of area in which regional organizations can make a major

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

contribution, in collaboration and coordination with the United Nations, to tackle potential threats to international peace and security.

Cooperation between the European Community Monitoring Mission and the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the field has been close. It is now paralleled at the very highest political level in the Conference on the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which the Secretary- General and Prime Minister Major co-chaired in September, and which is now continuing in Geneva.

We note the Secretary-General's comments on the vital issue of the safety of peace-keeping personnel. There may be cases where it would be useful for the Security Council to warn the parties before deployment that collective measures will be considered if United Nations personnel are attacked or the purposes of a United Nations operation are frustrated. We take this opportunity to reiterate our call to all host countries and all parties to a conflict to do everything possible to ensure the safety of United Nations peace-keeping personnel and to respect their international status. We also pay tribute to the men and women who are serving in peace-keeping operations in the field, and to those who have served in the past. They often serve in difficult and dangerous conditions, and, tragically, some have lost their lives in the service of peace - 29 this year alone. And if I may be permitted a personal remark at this point, I would say that it is high time the Organization found some way to mark in a memorial the names of those whose lives have been lost on behalf of the United Nations.

The European Community member States make a substantial financial as well as military contribution to peace-keeping operations. The figures speak

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

for themselves. Twelve member States of the European Community are supposed to contribute one third of the cost of peace-keeping operations as financed through assessed contributions. At the end of August this year these 12 countries had in fact given 40.1 per cent of the actual contributions collected so far for the various new operations launched or expanded since the end of the previous General Assembly session. In fact, the true costs of peace-keeping considerably exceed that figure. Those European Community member States participating in the new operations in Bosnia will do so, exceptionally, at no cost to the United Nations. And as Mr. Hurd, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, said in the general debate, we are doing our bit; we look to others to do the same.

The Secretary-General is quite right to say that the financial problems of the United Nations must not be allowed to fester. Nearly two thirds of the membership are behind in their payments. And it is particularly unfortunate that these include major contributors. The Organization's ability to intervene is critically dependent in the short term on the availability of financial resources. We therefore support the proposed peace-keeping reserve fund, subject to negotiation on the detail. The detailed arrangements in this case are for the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. I hope very much that we will reach a decision on this point during the course of this General Assembly session. I must stress that there is a relationship between the financing of peace-keeping and the overall financial situation of the United Nations. The same need for prompt and full payment of assessed contributions applies there, too.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

In conclusion, the European Community and its member States welcome "An Agenda for Peace" as a valuable contribution to the continuing debate on the role of the United Nations in international affairs. We believe that the action points should now be followed up in the appropriate bodies - for example, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, the Charter Committee, the Fifth Committee, the Security Council and the Secretariat - and of course also by Member States themselves and by regional organizations. It is important that no time be lost in pursuing these points in an action-oriented way in these forums, and we see the main objective of this debate as being to provide stimulus to that decision- making. We look forward to continuing the discussion and collaboration with other delegations in pursuit of this objective.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): In his first annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General identified clearly the opportunities and challenges facing the United Nations in the post-cold-war era.

We have in this new era new opportunities for enhanced global cooperation to tackle transnational problems, problems: of the environment; arms control; drugs; AIDS; and of course the continuing tragedy of poverty. We also face challenges arising from the unleashing of ethnic rivalries and the splintering of nation States.

Simply, the demands on the United Nations have never been greater, nor the expectations so high.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

In his report to the Assembly, the Secretary-General has set himself the ambitious but essential goal of creating "a new United Nations for a new international era" (A/47/1, para. 5) - a process which he acknowledges will be "neither easy nor risk-free" (A/47/1, para.6).

The "new United Nations" is being put to the test, dramatically, by the outbreak of conflict, often within and between newly emerging States. In his landmark report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277), the Secretary-General focused on the need to enhance the capacity of the United Nations to fulfil its fundamental Charter objective of "maintaining international peace and security" by summarizing a range of actions to prevent, contain and resolve situations of conflict.

The front line of United Nations involvement in peace and security should be the prevention of conflict. We should be working through the United Nations to create conditions which minimize insecurity and threats to peace, and which enable specific high-risk situations to be addressed before they get to the point of requiring either peace-keeping or, worse still, coercive peace-enforcement measures.

A major challenge in the years ahead will be to establish effective mechanisms and means for converting the potential promise of preventive diplomacy from rhetoric into reality.

In his statement to the General Assembly last week, the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Senator Gareth Evans, outlined a series of initiatives designed to address the non-military, as well as military threats to security. Natural disasters, acute poverty, famine and environmental degradation are all fundamental causes of instability and thus the United Nations must assume a major role in addressing such non-military threats to international peace and security.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Australia particularly welcomes the creation of the new Department of Humanitarian Affairs, which has a crucial role to play in seeking to avert preventable tragedies. One such area where we would like to see an enhanced United Nations role is in the prevention of famine. To this end, we have proposed the establishment of a group of senior officials from developed and developing countries and relevant United Nations agencies, supported by a comprehensive database, to conduct high-level reviews of the global famine situation and to identify emerging crisis situations. Surely this is a case where prevention is vastly preferable to cure.

We also endorse the Secretary-General's observation in his report on the work of the Organization that democratic structures, popular participation and observance of human rights are all fundamental sources of creativity in the process of development. Economic development and political progress go hand in hand and can mutually reinforce resolution of many of the underlying tensions which lead to conflict.

Today's discussion of "An Agenda for Peace" is a beginning, not an end. We expect the debate to continue and amplify, involving the whole United Nations membership. The contribution that we will make today will highlight one aspect of an "agenda for peace" which we believe to be of particular importance to the current international situation, namely strengthening the role of the United Nations in preventive diplomacy. We plan to take up other aspects of what is a large, but very necessary, agenda in subsequent discussions on "An Agenda for Peace" in this and other relevant forums.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Turning to the issue that I would like to highlight today, I will centre my remarks on means of strengthening the United Nations preventive diplomacy and peacemaking arrangements to deal at an early stage with specific high-risk situations. Others may have their own ideas, and we believe that it is crucial that those ideas be put forward, so that all ideas can be discussed and suggestions further refined in order that we may establish a truly viable system for preventing disputes at the international and regional levels. Indeed, we believe that preventive diplomacy is so important that it should become a major foundation-stone on which the United Nations new agenda for peace is built.

One of the major stumbling-blocks to preventive diplomacy has been the problem of timing. The Charter explicitly states, in Article 36, that the United Nations may become involved "at any stage of a dispute ... or of a situation" and the 1988 Declaration on the Prevention and Removal of Disputes, which was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, encourages the United Nations to become involved "at an early stage" (resolution 43/51, annex, para. 1 (12)).

In practice, however, the threshold for defining a situation as a threat to international peace and security has tended to be the outbreak of armed hostilities. Typically, the Security Council has waited for this threshold to be crossed before it has acted. In cases where the Secretary-General waits to be mandated by the Council before acting, the United Nations often finds itself intervening at the very point where the disputing parties are least likely to accept peaceful methods of dispute resolution - in other words, when it is too late.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Effective preventive diplomacy, however, requires action before a dispute has reached that threshold, that is, as early as possible - before the issues have generalized; before antagonisms have become malignant; before the major motivation of the parties has become a desire for retribution, and before parties have become committed and entrapped by their own aggressive posturing, rhetoric and actions.

The overriding reason for parties' reluctance to bring disputes to the United Nations appears to be concern about losing control over decision-making. Discussions about the rights of "sovereignty" and concerns about "internationalizing" a dispute translate to mean that many, and probably most, States prefer to maintain control over how their disputes will be resolved, at least until such time as the situation becomes desperate. Because of these sensitivities, third parties have also been reluctant to bring a situation to the Council at an early stage. Thus, Members seldom use Article 35, which allows any Member of the United Nations to bring a dispute to the attention of the Council, and similarly, past Secretaries-General have rarely used Article 99.

In our view, the United Nations needs to develop a mechanism which will be acceptable to Members and which will allow those who cannot reach a peaceful settlement on their own to avail themselves of mediation and good offices at an early stage in their dispute.

What is needed is a mechanism which can offer a dispute resolution service to its Members to assist them in complying with Chapter VI of the Charter. Through such a mechanism, Members could maintain a say over how their dispute is settled, while at the same time receiving assistance in

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

communicating with one another - in minimizing inflammatory rhetoric; in defining the issues, concerns and grievances which are causing the dispute, and in creating innovative and imaginative solutions which can address and reconcile these conflicting interests. There is an increasing recognition among Member States that it is the Secretary-General and his staff who can most effectively offer this kind of assistance.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Some of these ideas are already being implemented within the Secretariat. Australia applauds the efforts made by the Secretary-General to establish geographically-based Divisions within the Department of Political Affairs, whose task it will be to monitor various regions. We believe that, if properly supported and resourced, the six Divisions that have been set up hold considerable promise for providing continuity in conflict-prevention. To be effective, however, this newly developed preventive diplomacy and peacemaking mechanism will need the support of Member States.

For preventive diplomacy to succeed, it will require adequate resources and staff who have a sophisticated level of expertise and skill. Currently the six Divisions are headed by Directors who have had considerable experience in good offices and peacemaking. They will, however, need to be supported by staff who are skilled in political analysis and who have an in-depth knowledge of the cultural, political and historical background of the countries of the region.

Staff will also be needed who are knowledgeable in conflict-analysis, negotiation and mediation. Recruitment of new staff, training of current staff through programmes such as the proposed new fellowship programme on preventive diplomacy and peacemaking of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the use of expert consultants could all provide the necessary skills for carrying out preventive diplomacy.

In addition, staff will be needed who can devote their full attention to preventive diplomacy without being consumed by the demands of ongoing, larger crises. They will need to be backed up with an adequate infrastructure. Access to wire services, on-line computer facilities, data banks, advanced

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

telecommunications and travel for routine visits to the field and to relevant meetings will be required.

Resources for these vital tasks could be redeployed from other parts of the United Nations where they are no longer needed. Indeed, perhaps the most important way in which Member States could contribute to the development of this new mechanism is through their support of such a reallocation of resources. The amounts involved would not be large, but the benefits accruing to all of us could be considerable. Of course, Members could also assist the Secretary-General in developing an adequate infrastructure by providing voluntary contributions earmarked for much needed expenses.

Another way in which Member States could assist the Secretariat would be to offer expertise through the secondment of experts to help in tasks such as the creation of a rapid response information network; the development of creative proposals for particular disputes; and the training of middle-level staff in political analysis and dispute-resolution. This kind of contribution from Member States has become commonplace in the area of peace-keeping, and could also be very useful in the development of preventive diplomacy.

Preventive-diplomacy units will need to establish a rapid-response information network which can provide continuous and reliable information and which will be responsive to changing situations. Members could assist the Secretary-General by providing regular information on disputes, tensions and developments in their region. A wide range of sources would allow preventive-diplomacy staff to examine the reliability of information and would provide them with the full range of perspectives on the issues involved. Of course, an independent capacity, on the part of the Secretariat, to assess relevant information will be a crucial element in determining its credibility and usefulness.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Regular and routine visits to the capitals and "hot spots" of the region would allow Secretariat staff to identify emerging disputes, to track developments in existing disputes, to develop a sense of trust and a reputation for fairness, to urge the parties to come to the negotiating table and to offer good offices and mediation when it is deemed appropriate. Such visits would also allow United Nations staff to coordinate on a regular and consistent basis with United Nations agencies in the field, as well as with regional and subregional organisations.

Members could assist United Nations staff in developing contacts within their countries and their region and facilitate and encourage regular visits of preventive diplomacy staff. This would allow quiet diplomacy to develop in a manner which did not call attention to itself, and which did not "internationalise" the dispute. Routine visits would, we believe, be more acceptable to parties than formally constituted "fact-finding" missions, especially if carried out as standard United Nations practice throughout all regions. Thus we believe that quiet diplomacy and early prevention should be the essence of preventive diplomacy. Such a mechanism will, we believe, be more acceptable to Members and, therefore, more effective.

Finally, Members may be able to assist the Secretary-General and his staff in providing or supporting good offices and mediation. The assistance of the five Central American Presidents in the resolution of the El Salvador dispute and the Paris Conference on Cambodia are but two examples of how third parties can assist the United Nations in dispute-resolution through persuasion or the development of new ideas or proposals.

Australia therefore urges Members to do everything they can to support the efforts of the Secretary-General to establish an effective mechanism for

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

carrying out preventive diplomacy. In terms of United Nations operations, preventive diplomacy is certainly cost-effective when compared to peace-keeping operations or peace-enforcement.

But, even more importantly, it is cost-effective in human terms. When disputes are resolved through preventive diplomacy, we can avoid the tragic and wanton loss of life of countless men, women and children, such as we are now witnessing in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. The needless destruction of homes, cities and social infrastructure could be averted. Resources that would have been spent on weapons and war could be available instead to be applied to the social and economic problems of these societies. When disputes are settled through preventive diplomacy, grievances are lessened or ameliorated, and hostilities between peoples do not fester and grow into reverberating echoes of violence.

Of course, some parties will not want to avail themselves of preventive diplomacy, and, even when they do, in some cases it will not work. But even if preventive diplomacy is effective only now and then, it is worth the effort. If, by having an effective preventive diplomacy-mechanism in place, we could have prevented one situation from deteriorating into a Somalia or a Yugoslavia or an Iran-Iraq war or an Afghanistan or a Cambodia, would it not have been worth while? Should we not proceed with all haste to prevent the possibility of future bloodshed in disputes such as those brewing in Nogorno-Karabakh, Georgia and elsewhere?

A new time requires new approaches, bold steps. Preventive diplomacy is one such step. It would provide a clear response to the particular challenges we face in this new international era.

Mr. VAZQUEZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the countries members of the Permanent Mechanism for Consultation and Political Concertation, known as the Rio Group - that is, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Honduras, on behalf of four Central American countries; Jamaica, on behalf of 11 countries members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM); and Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela and Argentina.

Our countries have felt impelled to take part in the debate on agenda item 10, the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace". That report, which was requested by the Security Council Summit Meeting held on 31 January 1992, is a valuable instrument that enables us to initiate an immediate debate on the strengthening and the future of the Organization. We also consider it necessary for the debate to take place in the General Assembly, the only principal organ of the United Nations with universal membership.

It is appropriate to recall that the Rio Group took the initiative of issuing statements, circulated as documents A/47/232 and S/24025, prior to the submission of the Secretary-General's report. We have noted with satisfaction the existence of a broad area of agreement between our proposals and the contents of "An Agenda for Peace".

The international community has entered a new stage, one in which the United Nations is undoubtedly reserved an important role. In order to live up to the challenges of the new era, we must deal with issues relating to collective security within the framework of a renewed commitment to the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. In so doing, we shall be able to begin without delay the task of strengthening the United Nations in the spheres of preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping.

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

The Secretary-General's report introduces a number of interesting concepts and proposals. Some of them are aimed at the full enforcement of the United Nations Charter, others at improving the work of the Organization. There are also innovative proposals. All of them open the way for reflection and decision-making. Today, we should like to expound on our Group's initial position.

The framework for a discussion of this document must, we repeat, be the letter and spirit of the Organization's Charter. In particular, that discussion must be based on respect for the principles of sovereignty, non-intervention, sovereign equality, the territorial integrity of States, the self-determination of peoples, and the powers and areas of competence of the principal organs of the United Nations.

First, we should like to discuss the concept of preventive diplomacy. The analysis of this issue is important for all United Nations bodies and regional organizations and, because of its undeniable impact on the revitalization of the United Nations system, it should be the subject of direct consultations between the Secretary-General and Member States.

At its last session the General Assembly made an important contribution with the adoption by consensus of resolution 46/59, which includes the Declaration on Fact-finding by the United Nations in the Field of the Maintenance of International Peace and Security. Since its inception, the Rio Group has considered social and economic instability an important factor in the generation of conflicts. Measures aimed at promoting economic and social development must be included in the concept of preventive diplomacy.

Secondly, another important aspect of the Secretary-General's report is the question of peacemaking. The General Assembly, the Security Council and

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

the Secretary-General are empowered to take measures, excluding the use of force, to limit the magnitude of a conflict and lead the search for a solution. Regional organizations can also play an important role in this connection.

All efforts to promote a diplomatic settlement of disputes should be made in a timely manner. The mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes provided in Chapter VI of the Charter must be exhausted before recourse is had to other measures.

We support a discussion of whether the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in the case of disputes in which the Secretary-General has been requested to act or has been assigned a role and the States parties to the dispute give their consent for such a request to be made.

Thirdly, with regard to peace-keeping operations, it is important to recognize that such operations constitute a relevant tool for the international community to use in leading conflicts towards negotiations, and sometimes for containing armed confrontation.

Such peace-keeping operations are perceived by international public opinion as one of the most effective and prestigious activities of the United Nations, and they generate high expectations. Such prestige is certainly well deserved and entails a high degree of sacrifice from the men and women who take part in these operations.

Over the past 40 years the United Nations Secretariat has acquired a high level of experience in handling peace-keeping operations. The Secretariat and Member States, through the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, may improve those operations and make the necessary adjustments to the rather new

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

characteristics and patterns that emerge. In that connection we should like to emphasize General Assembly resolution 46/48.

Today, one of the most serious constraints such activities face is financial in nature. Yet the cost of peace-keeping operations is infinitely lower than the cost of war. It is important to ensure the Organization's financial ability to carry out this task.

For the Rio Group, the financing of peace-keeping operations is a collective but differentiated activity. In this, the permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility. The present system of financing must be given predictability and stability by the institutionalization of the system of assessed contributions established in General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII).

Fourthly, the consolidation of peace once conflicts have ended is a concept related to that of preventive diplomacy. The Rio Group considers that this process should focus, through concrete measures, on the economic and social spheres as well as on all those areas directly related to the various aspects of security.

Fifthly, we have already made reference to regional organizations. A closer relationship between the United Nations and those organizations must be sought within the framework of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter and the charters of those organizations. The Rio Group considers that the current and potential role to be played by the regional organizations in preventive diplomacy and peacemaking and peace-keeping is very important. In that connection the Organization of American States has already stated its willingness to cooperate with the United Nations and coordinate its efforts to improve collective means of preventing and solving conflicts.

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

In its document the Rio Group has also brought up some points relating to the Security Council, the body with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Given the increasing role of the Security Council, it is becoming ever more necessary that its work reflect a clear awareness that in carrying out its tasks the Council acts on behalf of the Members of the Organization. The Security Council's deliberative and decision-making processes must be transparent. While the value and usefulness of informal consultations should not be overlooked, Article 31 of the Charter, regarding the participation of States that are not members of the Security Council in those questions that affect their interests, should be borne in mind.

Today more than ever before it is important to highlight the role that could be played by the reports of the Security Council to the General Assembly. Such reports, in so far as they are substantive, could be the channel of communication between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as provided for in Article 15, paragraph 1 and Article 24, paragraph 3 of the Charter. As regards decisions of the Security Council that affect third parties, practical mechanisms need to be set up for the effective implementation of Article 50 of the Charter.

The Rio Group has identified other suggestions included in the Secretary-General's report that in its view will undoubtedly also call for a slow and careful analysis by all Member States. We shall not try to cover them all and we shall mention just a few: an invitation from the Security Council to a revitalized and restructured Economic and Social Council to report on events that might threaten international peace and security;

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

preventive deployment of a United Nations presence along the border of a party to a conflict at the request of that party and a request for unilateral preventive deployment if there is fear of a transboundary attack; the establishment of demilitarized zones as a form of preventive deployment; preventive deployment in the event of an internal crisis in a country, at its request; the use of military force in accordance with the mechanisms provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter; early adherence to the special agreements provided for in Article 43 of the Charter, in order to put troops at the disposal of the Security Council on a permanent basis; the establishment of peace-enforcement units; the adoption of measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, in the event of threats to the security of United Nations staff members; and various proposals for the financing of peace-keeping operations.

The Rio Group considers that the foregoing issues are of great importance and require urgent examination by the international community. In this context, we should now turn to the question of the procedures that should be adopted for a practical future discussion of the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and the decisions required to implement it.

The Security Council has set up a working group made up of its members to identify the areas that should be considered and acted upon by the Council. Some subsidiary organs of the General Assembly have already begun examining the report of the Secretary-General.

In the light of the foregoing, the Rio Group considers it advisable for the General Assembly to establish an open-ended working group that would examine the "Agenda for Peace" and submit to the Assembly recommendations or

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

decisions on those proposals that are of concern to the General Assembly. That working group would undoubtedly contribute to the establishment of a dialogue with other organs to which the report is addressed and would provide political orientation for the specialized subsidiary organs. The member countries of the Rio Group are convinced that because of its importance and scope the "Agenda for Peace" deserves our deep appreciation and that we must carefully analyse it. That is the reason for our interest in creating the proposed working group.

We cannot finish this statement without recalling, as we did in the Rio Group document, that

> "international peace and security will be genuinely guaranteed to the extent that the underlying causes of conflicts are eliminated. In reaffirming the importance of economic and social development as one of the basic premises underlying the strengthening of international peace and security, we believe that, along with violations of the Charter and other norms of international law, the disparity in wealth between nations, which leads to crises caused by a whole series of unmet needs, may be an important source of instablility in the post-cold-war world." (A/47/232, annex, para. 5)

The Rio Group considers that, although it is true that the "Agenda for Peace" constitutes a document of far-reaching importance for the Organization as far as its management and its objectives are concerned, it must be remembered that peace is only one of the issues that deserve our greatest attention. A more intense focus on development could consitute the "kind face" of the Organization, and for that reason it seems to us that the "Agenda for Peace" proposed by the Secretary-General must be accompanied by a true

(Mr. Vázquez, Argentina)

"agenda for development" which takes up the major socio-economic problems of our time with creativity and a vision for the future.

Mr. TÜRK (Slovenia): There comes a time for reflection and thought, and this is such a time. The general debate in the General Assembly has, over the past weeks, provided a wealth of ideas which reflect the changing world and has put before the Assembly the task of shaping those ideas into practical and meaningful action. Moreover, the reports by the Secretary-General which are currently under consideration, namely "An Agenda for Peace" and the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, provide an important analytical framework which will undoubtedly help the General Assembly in its effort to find an appropriate response to the challenges at hand. The delegation of Slovenia appreciates the Secretary-General's contribution in that regard, and we are pleased that the President has placed those documents before the General Assembly at this stage of the current session.

The maintenance of international peace and security is the most important responsibility of the United Nations and is one that pertains to all of its principal organs. Naturally, their respective competences define the actual modalities of their roles in this common endeavour. It must be recognized that international peace and security are highly complex matters and that careful consideration of all of their aspects, including political, economic and ecological aspects, is required. Slovenia believes that questions of international peace must be considered comprehensively, taking into account all their relevant aspects. In this framework we attach particular importance to the political dimension of international peace and security.

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

The situation prevailing after the end of the cold war is certainly not very comforting, and the search for adequate methods for maintaining international peace and security is probably more urgent than ever. It is relatively simple to plead for peace. It is much more difficult to guarantee security and to create stable conditions that would allow urgent and peaceful change in accordance with the principles upholding peace, security and prosperity. We believe that a comprehensive understanding of the tasks ahead calls for a thorough review of the role and the potential of all the principal United Nations organs, all of which can contribute to the more effective role of the Organization in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The agenda before us is broad and ambitious, and it is natural that some priorities have been set. In this connection we wish to stress again the importance of the political aspects of international peace and security and of the political organs of the United Nations. It is only in the context of that broader political approach that specific measures, including if need be military measures, can be properly conceived and carried out.

The delegation of Slovenia wishes to offer at this stage some thoughts on certain political aspects of the broader issue of international peace and security and on the role of the General Assembly in preventive diplomacy as one of the essential means in the process of maintaining international peace and security.

The United Nations Charter has provided several bases for an active role of the General Assembly in the context of preventive diplomacy. One of them is the competence of the Assembly, defined in Article 14 of the Charter, to

> "recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations".

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

In the past this provision was invoked in a number of situations, albeit less frequently than required. Let us only mention that in the early 1950s a particular aspect of the situation in the Balkans, arising from military and political pressure of a super-Power on a smaller State, was considered by the General Assembly on that basis. Action by the Assembly contributed very considerably to the containment of that situation and prevented its potential deterioration into an armed conflict.

At this very session the General Assembly was informed by the Foreign Ministers of Italy and Austria, two of Slovenia's neighbours, that the situation concerning the German-speaking inhabitants of Alto Adige or South Tyrol, in Italy had been successfully resolved. It is worth recalling that the General Assembly took up that situation, in 1960, on the basis of Article 14 of the United Nations Charter. The preventive effect of that action was important, and may serve today as a source of inspiration for dealing with certain new situations.

The provisions of Article 14 of the United Nations Charter are invaluable for the General Assembly, which may - at the initiative of a Member State or of the Secretary-General - address any political situation, "regardless of origin", much before it deteriorates into an open dispute or even into a situation involving a threat to international peace and security.

Article 14 of the United Nations Charter clearly permits various types of action by the General Assembly. According to an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, delivered in 1962 - to be found in International Court of Justice Reports, 1962, page 163 - the General Assembly may not only make substantive or procedural recommendations regarding "the peaceful adjustment" of the situation, but, so the Court said, may take any measure short of coercive action. In our opinion, therefore, the General

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

Assembly may create working bodies and develop various methods to supervise the implementation of its decisions concerning situations considered on the basis of Article 14 of the Charter. It goes without saying that in pursuit of such an approach a certain amount of imagination and a great deal of hard diplomatic work would be required.

The report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" contains a series of ideas concerning cooperation between the United Nations and regional arrangements and organizations. Indeed, it would be a serious omission if that aspect of international efforts for the maintenance of international peace and security were overlooked. The Secretary-General correctly states, in paragraph 61 of the report that

> "The Charter deliberately provides no precise definition of regional arrangements and agencies, thus allowing useful flexibility."

It is important to understand the changing nature of such arrangements in changed circumstances, that is, the fact that some regional arrangements may become obsolete, while others gain new roles and potential which go substantially beyond the original design.

Recent changes, in particular those that took place in Europe, have illustrated the dynamic nature of regional arrangements with abundant clarity. Whereas some organizations, including the Warsaw Treaty Organization, ceased to exist, others, including in particular the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), gained completely new roles which are much more ambitious than originally designed.

In some instances new circumstances give rise to the creation of entirely new groupings, such as the Central European Group - formerly known as the "pentagonal" and for a period of time as the "hexagonal" group.

The new and dynamic roles of regional arrangements can be seen in all

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

regions of the world, and they include a variety of groups, such as the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Rio Group and others.

How best can the United Nations take advantage of this dynamic element in international relations and, more specifically, how useful can such groups become in the future activities of the General Assembly?

An interpretation which would limit this potential only to the framework defined in Article 53 of the Charter - that is, the utilization of regional arrangements by the Security Council for enforcement action - would certainly fall short of actual needs. In order fully to utilize their potential and to realize maximum effect, it is necessary to develop a continuous and productive dialogue, perhaps within the General Assembly, focused on those issues which can best be understood in the context of regional arrangements. Full advantage must be taken of the fact that regional arrangements - as a rule - provide an important opportunity for understanding local circumstances, the roots and the history of a given problem, and possible solutions. It is not necessary that such a dialogue with regional arrangements be made contingent upon any formal stipulation. The important requirement here is that it be conducted in accordance with the principles of the Charter and that it yield proper and practical results. The relations between the United Nations and regional institutions should be seen in terms not of subordination but of cooperation and dialogue.

I should now like to proceed to a specific thematic issue which has recently given rise to serious consideration, namely to the issue of national and ethnic minorities. The General Assembly will soon have before it a declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities. The Secretary-General has reminded us in his "Agenda for Peace" that "The League of Nations provided a machinery for the

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

international protection of minorities". The adoption of that declaration, "together with the increasingly effective machinery of the United Nations dealing with human rights, should enhance the situation of minorities as well as the stability of States". (A/47/277, para. 18)

Here, as we see, the Secretary-General has placed a great deal of hope in United Nations machinery dealing with human rights. However, a note of caution seems appropriate. Like all other international machinery in the field of human rights, the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations lack specific experience in dealing with questions involving different minorities. Furthermore, such situations usually involve a political dimension which goes beyond human rights considerations, and this should be duly heeded.

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

Coordinated action by the human rights bodies of the United Nations and the appropriate political organs, including, when circumstances so warrant, the General Assembly, would be appropriate. I referred earlier, in the context of my references to Article 14 of the Charter, to a specific situation involving a minority - the German-speaking inhabitants of Alto Adige/South Tyrol in Italy - a situation which was successfully dealt with and resolved by due reference to the General Assembly resolutions adopted on the basis of Article 14 of the Charter. It is worth keeping in mind that that case was not brought before the General Assembly as a case involving only issues of human rights. It was raised and resolved primarily as a political issue. The lesson for the future is this: there are situations where it is necessary to address the political dimension of problems involving minorities. Let me add in passing that such situations often arise in areas where there is no clear ethnic majority or in those States where there is no single ethnic majority. Political solutions must be sought in such situations, and political organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, should be active. In fact, the General Assembly could develop a very useful role in such matters and could, if need be, act through appropriate ad hoc bodies constituted for this purpose.

We are fully aware of the fact that the ideas expressed in this statement require critical consideration and further refinement. We are also looking forward to the comments other participants in this discussion will have to make. Like other delegations, we too are aware of the complexity of issues addressed in the Secretary-General's reports currently under consideration. However, all this should not deter us from the attempt to find new answers to old and new questions. The expectations of world opinion are high and our responsibility is considerable. It would be too ambitious to expect that the

(Mr. Türk, Slovenia)

debate of these few days in plenary meetings alone will yield optimal results. Therefore we believe that it would be appropriate to conduct, throughout this session of the General Assembly, a series of informal consultations on all pertinent questions dealt with in the Secretary-General's reports currently being discussed in plenary meetings, with a view to preparing appropriate decisions to be adopted at the end of the session. Perhaps we should invite you, Mr. President, together with the General Committee, to develop the most appropriate working method of informal consultations which would help the Assembly to formulate the right decisions and to respond to the challenges of our time, including in particular those reflected in the Secretary-General's reports. It goes without saying that the representatives of Slovenia will assist in such an endeavour to the best of their abilities.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform representatives that, with a view to assisting delegations in their deliberations under agenda item 10, the Secretariat has prepared a paper compiling all of the specific recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace". The document was issued yesterday under the symbol A/INF/47/5 and is available at the documents distribution counter.

Mr. HAJNOCZI (Austria): Austria welcomes this opportunity to comment on this year's report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization (A/47/1), which builds on his earlier, seminal report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277). Both are timely and inspiring documents. Timely, because never before have countries and peoples of the world relied more on the United Nations; timely, because - as Austrian Federal Chancellor Vranitzky put it during the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January:

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

"... the end of the cold war has freed minds and resources which were for so long bound by a wasteful and useless confrontation". (S/PV.3046, p.61) Inspiring, because the world is now a better but less stable place, which creates almost daily new tasks and new challenges for the Organization.

In the Security Council Austria has advocated substantive and urgent consideration of the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" concerning the Council since the report was issued in June. We hope that such a consideration will now take place there, with Council members having the benefit of the views heard during the general debate and again today. Foreign Minister Mock has already expressed Austria's support for further efforts to improve the capacity of the United Nations in conflict-prevention, peace-keeping, peacemaking and peace-building.

Today, I shall therefore limit myself to commenting on aspects which concern primarily the General Assembly. While I shall attempt to be as succinct as possible, one more general remark is in order: instability and insecurity have many sources - military, political, economic, ethnic, religious, social, humanitarian and ecological. We must therefore take an integrated, comprehensive approach even though it will be implemented only step by step.

The Secretary-General shares this view - and has expressed it much more eloquently. Austria supports the following recommendations concerning the General Assembly - in the order in which they appear in his report "An Agenda for Peace": increased resort to fact-finding missions, especially for preventive purposes, with the understanding that there will be a follow-up; impartially provided humanitarian assistance, including civilian assistance in maintaining security; utilizing the General Assembly's role as a universal

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

forum to consider and recommend action to pre-empt or contain situations likely to threaten international peace and security; authorizing the Secretary-General to take advantage of the advisory competence of the International Court of Justice; mobilizing the resources of the whole United Nations system for the amelioration of disputes through assistance; consideration of the idea of financing peace-keeping operations from defence budgets; improving training for civilian, police and military peace-keeping personnel; promoting good governance at all levels. Here we would stress in particular the strengthening of democratic processes and institutions, which the United Nations can foster by providing advice, assistance and monitors; consultations between the United Nations and regional arrangements - in the case of Europe, Austria has proposed the creation of a liaison mechanism between the United Nations and the relevant European arrangements, in particular the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), whose Conflict Prevention Centre and Security Forum are both located in Vienna - recommending measures to improve the safety of United Nations personnel; charging interest on the amounts of assessed contributions that are not paid in time; increasing the Working Capital Fund and the establishment of a revolving peace-keeping reserve fund.

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

Austria also welcomes the strong emphasis given in the report on the work of the Organization to the role of the United Nations in international economic relations. The overwhelming problems of poverty, underdevelopment, population pressures, mass migration, depletion of the ozone layer, global warming and environmental degradation cannot be dealt with successfully by any one country or any group of countries no matter how powerful they might be. These global issues force all nations to acknowledge their interdependence. It is to be hoped that this will lead to greater solidarity and equity in the dealings of nations with one another. The United Nations, and probably only the United Nations, can provide a framework in which this new global partnership for sustainable development can be translated into concrete policy formulation and implementation. Austria pledges its full support for the Secretary-General in pursuing the goals that he formulates in his report for the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields. In this context we feel that it would be desirable to find appropriate ways to consolidate the formidable analytical capacity of the United Nations system so that economic policy guidance can be given by the United Nations that would indeed influence political decisions of economic actors by virtue of the very quality of the assessments on which the recommendations are based. We have formulated detailed proposals concerning a system of consolidated reports in the context of the Economic and Social Council's ad hoc Committee on Enhancing International Cooperation for Development: The Role of the United Nations System.

In his report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General has also rightly emphasized the importance of the promotion of human rights as one of the priority objectives of the Charter, along with preserving international

(Mr. Hajnoczi, Austria)

peace and security and promoting development. He has also stressed their interrelatedness. Austria supports his proposal that he and expert human rights bodies be empowered to bring massive violations of human rights to the attention of the Security Council, together with recommendations for action. We also wholeheartedly endorse his view that the United Nations must be able to take preventive measures and that the World Conference on Human Rights, to be held in Vienna in 1993, will be important in this regard. A report from a group of experts commissioned by the Secretary-General on possible preventive strategies in the social, humanitarian and human rights fields could be a useful basis for our further deliberations.

To sum up: Austria is profoundly convinced of the inextricable interrelationship between the political, the socio-economic and the humanitarian missions of the United Nations. It is our hope that in the course of this session of the General Assembly, and inspired by the proposals of the Secretary-General, we will be able to advance on all tracks in our pursuit of a more just world order where men, women and children in every part of the globe can live in peace and freedom and enjoy a fair share of the Earth's resources without jeopardizing their children's ability to do the same in the future.

Mr. MONTAÑO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The Mexican delegation fully supports the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, on behalf of the Rio Group, in relation to the present agenda item. We should nevertheless like to note a number of points which are of particular interest to the Government of Mexico.

The invitation to the Secretary-General by the summit meeting of the Security Council to submit to the membership of the United Nations an analysis

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

and recommendations on ways of strengthening and making more efficient the capacity of the United Nations for preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping, was undoubtedly a response to the universal concern to find adequate formulas for meeting the challenges the community of nations faces as a result of the end of the cold war.

The content of "An Agenda for Peace" calls for joint reflection and invites us to seek, in constant dialogue with the Secretary-General, the means and mechanisms for giving the United Nations the necessary capacity to discharge its delicate mandate in the maintenance of international peace and security. The holding of this debate, which we have always urged and encouraged, is convincing proof of our interest in the report, the importance we attach to it, and the need for careful consideration of its recommendations.

"An Agenda for Peace" is rich in ideas, imaginative in conception and ambitious in the proposals it makes, on a par with the great challenges facing the Organization. It makes contributions which already undoubtedly lay the foundations for the new and more enduring structures the United Nations needs in this new phase of international life, which are referred to clearly in the "Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization", which was submitted recently for consideration by the General Assembly.

Progress in building these structures calls for a concerted effort by all Members of the Organization, and accordingly the Secretary-General's statement in "An Agenda for Peace" that the foundation stone of the work of the United Nations "is and must remain the State" (para. 17) seems to us fundamental. Respect for the fundamental sovereignty of States is critical in any international process. This is a matter of practical realism, not simply a position of principle.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

The ideas contained in the report aimed at achieving a better balance between the principal organs of the United Nations appear to us timely and appropriate. The strengthening of the Organization must be carried out within the framework of the functions and responsibilities assigned to each of the principal organs. The primacy which the Charter assigns to the General Assembly, as the Organization's universal and pluralist governing body par excellence needs to be recalled and reaffirmed. One of the tasks the Secretary-General's report puts before us is that of achieving greater coordination between the Assembly and the Security Council in questions relating to international peace and security.

Strengthening the Secretary-General's capacity for action is an important step towards creating an Organization capable of responding in a timely and effective manner to the growing demands placed upon it by Member States. Hence, the continued importance of smooth coordination between the functions of the Secretariat and those of the principal organs.

The Secretary-General's report is valuable not only for the proposals it contains but also for the ideas it suggests. We believe that the chapter on preventive diplomacy could well be supplemented by the one that deals with post-conflict peace-building. In particular, we consider that support should be given to the idea that the efforts to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people should also be regarded as preventive mechanisms.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

Mexico's experience as a member of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General in the dispute with El Salvador confirms this view.

Likewise, we consider that an affirmative response should be given to the recommendation that the Secretary-General be authorized to seek advisory opinions from the International Court of Justice, of course with the consent of the States involved. We believe that this will also strengthen the Secretary-General's capacity for preventive diplomacy.

As we have noted, the concepts and ideas in the report merit careful study. In particular, we feel that greater clarity is needed with regard to some of the more innovative proposals, such as preventive deployment. This is a concept which needs to be more precisely defined in order to make it clear in what situations and in what way that mechanism would be employed. We should point out at this juncture that the adoption of any measure that might impair sovereign rights or be transformed into an excuse to intervene in the internal affairs of States would cause us concern.

In the same context, we consider that what is referred to as:

"support for the transformation of deficient national structures and capabilities, and for the strengthening of new democratic institutions" (A/47/277, para. 59)

- albeit a worthy proposal - merits cautious consideration, since these ideas fall exclusively within the sovereignty of States.

My delegation is aware that the content of the "Agenda for Peace" should not be viewed as a fixed package, but as a set of proposals applicable to the short, the medium and the long term. Like any political endeavour, it calls for in-depth and substantive analysis of its costs and benefits. Nevertheless, in defining the priorities a pragmatic approach needs to be

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

taken that will make it possible to identify, on the basis of daily practice, problems capable of being resolved in the shortest possible time. In this respect, there is an urgent need to define and lay the foundations for recognition of the fact that there are members of the international community which bear greater responsibility for meeting the financial requirements needed to guarantee international peace and security.

Mexico wishes forcefully to support the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Twelve that, as soon as possible, a monument should be erected as a tribute to those who have fallen in the course of peace-keeping operations.

A document such as the one we are considering today needs to be viewed in the broader context of the Organization's activities as described in the Secretary-General's report (A/47/1), which correctly avers that States see the United Nations as an instrument capable of maintaining international peace and security, of "advancing justice and human rights, and of promoting, in the words of the Charter, social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom".

As the Secretary-General rightly points out in his report, the historic time we are living through constitutes "an opportunity regained" (A/47/1, Introduction). We have entered upon a new phase of international life which makes it incumbent upon us to fulfil the promises and expectations that in recent decades were disappointed. It is time for the United Nations to have the means, including the political will, needed to give shape to the responsibility conferred on it by the Charter to promote economic and social development.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

We agree that the United Nations:

"is the only institution capable of comprehensively addressing global problems in their political, humanitarian and socio-economic dimensions." (A/47/1, para. 68)

The international structure requires better and more effective diplomatic instruments for conflict prevention, and for peace-building. But this structure is clearly fragile if it does not include mechanisms for ensuring the full economic and social development of all peoples. The need to take an approach that integrates the objectives of peace and security with the overall objectives of development, at an equivalent level of priority, is an idea that meets with our strongest support. We shall seek to work together with the Secretary-General to make the development programme he proposes in his report a reality.

Just as the Security Council has begun analysing "An Agenda for Peace", we consider it appropriate for the General Assembly, as a principal organ of the Organization and the only one that is universal in nature, to do the same. Subsidiary bodies of the Assembly have already taken important steps in considering specific aspects of "An Agenda for Peace". Their deliberations will be of the greatest importance, and they should continue their valuable work.

For this reason we most strongly support the proposal made by the Rio Group to the effect that it would be desirable for the General Assembly to establish, under its guidance, a working group to consider "An Agenda for Peace". Such a group, of open-ended composition, will enable us to deal systematically and in detail with the content of the report. It will also open up channels for dialogue among all Member States on the important ideas

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

and proposals contained in the report, thus facilitating the adoption of decisions on those issues which merit the consensus support of this forum. Our idea is not aimed at usurping mandates or at impeding specialized consideration. On the contrary, we are seeking to bring into being a framework for analysis which will of itself constitute an active example of the principles of democracy and transparency in the work of the Organization. The suggested working group and the concomitant efforts being made will be the melting pot of ideas that is so much needed if we are not to lose the "opportunity regained".

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): The representative of Argentina has already expressed on behalf of the Rio Group, to which Brazil has the honour of belonging, the basic considerations of our delegations on the document "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

While fully endorsing those views, which reflect to a large extent the content of document A/47/232 circulated by the Rio Group last May, I would like to comment further on some of the elements contained in the report presented by the Secretary-General.

I wish to thank the Secretary-General for having prepared such a far-reaching document containing many new and relevant ideas and proposals. As stressed by the spokesman for the Rio Group, some of them aim at promoting the observance and implementation of the provisions of the Charter; others seek to improve the practices of the Organization. The ensemble of these ideas calls for thorough consideration by the entire membership of the United Nations.

A fast-evolving international environment entails a search for conceptual frameworks capable of dealing with change. A wide-ranging dialogue is called for in the interest of all States.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

In the post-cold-war era, when the arms race, which has consumed hundreds of billions of dollars annually, is beginning to abate, the opportunity should not be lost to address all dimensions of concern, including social and economic inequalities at the international level. As the representative of Brazil said in the opening speech of the general debate,

"An agenda for peace cannot overlook the agenda for development".

(A/47/PV.4, p. 22-25)

While strengthening the relevant activities of preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building, we must also strengthen the capability of the United Nations for the equally urgent task of preventive peace-building.

It is becoming increasingly clear that to maintain peace it is not enough to achieve a state of the absence of war. Peace should be understood as a dynamic process encompassing the concomitant promotion of fair international economic relations, strict respect for the rule of law, within and across borders, and the democratization of international relations.

As the representative of Argentina indicated, the Rio Group has identified a number of important questions contained in "An Agenda for Peace" that require careful consideration by the Members of the Organization. Many of the ideas presented in the Secretary-General's report - ideas such as preventive deployment, peace-enforcement units, early warning and sanctions under Chapter VII - are more of a military and intelligence-related nature. In the view of my delegation, a peace agenda should also underscore the importance of instances of a political and diplomatic nature.

In the broadest sense, it could be said that all activities of the United Nations are devoted to preventive diplomacy. To be effective and successful, diplomatic activities require a considerable degree of flexibility and

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

creativity. All peaceful means provided for in the Charter must be exhausted before military or other enforcement action is resorted to. There should be no automatic resort to action entailing the use of military means.

Before expanding on, or extrapolating from, selected provisions of the Charter, we must endeavour to make full use of the resources already provided for in the Charter. One may, for instance, contemplate a more active role for the General Assembly pursuant to Article 14, under which the Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation deemed likely to affect international peace and security. It is incumbent upon us to give more active expression to those provisions.

In this context, there is an important role for fact-finding activities, as regulated by the Declaration on Fact-finding by the United Nations in the Field of the Maintenance of International Peace and Security, adopted last year in resolution 46/59.

Another mechanism that could be more fully exploited - this time to facilitate the work of the Security Council - is the provision in Article 29 for the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs, composed not only of Council members, but also of relevant parties involved in a situation affecting international peace and security. In this regard, more than 20 years ago a memorandum by Brazil appeared in document A/7922, in which we suggested that the Security Council consider the desirability of establishing ad hoc committees for the peaceful settlement of disputes; we proposed that, when appropriate, and with due regard to the relevant provisions of the Charter, the Council could refer to such committees any dispute as described in Article 33 of the Charter, or a similar situation in order to promote or facilitate a solution in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

These ideas are but a few examples of diplomatic tools for preventive diplomacy and peacemaking that are already contemplated in the Charter and could be better utilized by the Organization.

The strengthening of the United Nations in the field of international peace and security requires the strengthening of all its relevant organs. The Charter provides the conditions for the effective and harmonious functioning of these different bodies, without conflict of competence. Their actions can and should be mutually reinforcing.

To prevent what the Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization (A/47/1) warns is a possible "crisis of expectations", we must provide adequate resources and conditions of work for all relevant organs, which in recent times have gone through a somewhat unbalanced process of revitalization. In fact, document A/47/1 reports, on page 6 "Expanding activities of the Security Council", an "Expanding role of peace-keeping" and "Expanding mandates of the Secretariat", but no corresponding expansion for the General Assembly can be reported at this stage.

The report on the work of the Organization presents data and tables that underscore the dramatic increase in the work-load of the Security Council and the related increases in peace-keeping operations and Secretariat activities. But, as my delegation sees it, we ought to avoid the assumption that any and all matters affecting international peace and security should necessarily be dealt with at the level of the Security Council. There are instances in which the General Assembly may have an important role to play. In others it might be more appropriate to entrust the leading role to regional organizations. Practice should allow for a harmonious and coordinated complementarity of roles between the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

and, as the case may be, regional organizations or the International Court of Justice.

An effective peace agenda should seek to promote revitalization of the General Assembly's role in the maintenance of international peace and security by making full use of the possibilities foreseen in Articles 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 17 of the Charter. In situations of international tension or crisis, an appropriate presence and action of the General Assembly should be felt immediately and constantly.

More room should be provided for the political and diplomatic efforts of the parties to the conflict themselves and of regional organizations. We believe that there should be clear recognition of the fact that the actions or arrangements of the United Nations and of regional organizations can and should be mutually reinforcing and complementary. But it should also be recognized that the United Nations and the regional organizations have their own Charters and their specific mandates and competence. Cooperation between the United Nations and the regional bodies should be carried out on the basis of coordination and consultation.

Turning specifically to the many concepts and recommendations contained in "An Agenda for Peace", my delegation would like to express some views, without prejudice to further deliberations, which we believe should be undertaken in the working group whose creation was today suggested by the representative of Argentina on behalf of the countries members of the Rio Group.

Preventive-diplomacy activities should be conducted strictly in accordance with Chapter VI of the Charter. Peacemaking activities should be guided by the definition contained in resolution 46/48, which was adopted last year. Peace-keeping operations, for their part, should scrupulously follow

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

the principles and practices accumulated by the Organization in acquiring experience in these matters. In view of the limited nature of existing precedents concerning the enforcement activities undertaken under Chapter VII, suggestions and recommendations as to their future modalities should be thoroughly and carefully examined by the membership at large. Post-conflict peace-building is still an evolving idea to be carefully implemented in accordance with the needs and wishes of the parties concerned. Thorough attention should be given to the task of preventive peace-building, taking into account the overall mandate and resources of the United Nations system.

My delegation believes that there is a need for greater communication and dialogue between the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General in the field of international peace and security. In the light of Article 24, there is a need for enhanced transparency in the Council's deliberative and decision-making processes; a need for more effective consultations with United Nations Members who are not members of the Council; and a need for the Council to listen to the wider membership of the Organization. In this respect, the annual report submitted by the Security Council to the General Assembly pursuant to paragraph 3 of Article 24 is an important instrument, which should be made less formal, less opaque and more substantive.

We welcome the trend to make the activities of the Secretariat more transparent and more accountable to all Member States. Early-warning information collected by the United Nations system should be made available promptly and systematically to the Member States concerned, as they are the parties most interested in prompt and appropriate action.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

On the subject of financing, the specific suggestions contained in "An Agenda for Peace" and in the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization should be subjected to a thorough examination by the proper subsidiary organs of the General Assembly. The special scale of assessment for the financing of peace-keeping operations recognizes the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council and reflects the effective capacity of Member States to pay, which is not reflected as clearly as it should be in the regular budget.

As was clearly stated in the Rio Group document of 28 May 1992:

> "Considerations of political and economic realism make the current financing system the only viable mechanism. It is therefore necessary to make the system predictable and stable by adopting permanently the current system of contributions for the financing of peace-keeping operations established under General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII) and subsequent resolutions." (A/47/232, annex, para. 22)

As crisis after crisis unfolds in this rapidly evolving world situation, new, and at times unprecedented, United Nations operations and missions are being promptly decided upon and set up and quickly dispatched to different areas of the world. Not all of these operations or missions can properly be called "peace-keeping" operations. The decisions on those operations and missions are difficult decisions that have in most cases been taken under the pressure of time and circumstances and on an ad hoc basis.

The maintenance of international peace and security should be a shared endeavour of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretariat, the relevant regional organizations and the States involved in specific situations. The complexities and diverse nature of crisis situations make it

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

difficult, if not impossible, to have recourse to standardized mechanisms. Each crisis is unique.

But it is clear that decisions must be based on the consistent and non-selective application of the provisions of the Charter. The General Assembly has yet to develop and adopt a clear set of guidelines for these operations, which have become a central aspect of the activity of our Organization. That is an important and urgent part of the task ahead of us in the days and weeks to come.

Ultimately, the prestige and legitimacy of the United Nations role in the maintenance of international peace and security rests on the good governance of the Organization itself. That can be ensured in the functioning of the relevant organs by means of transparency, equity, representation, accountability and mutuality of benefits and obligations on a non-discriminatory basis. We must see to it that the functions and powers of each organ, as well as its composition, ensure efficiency and authority. In deepening our deliberations on the building of a new peace agenda, we should keep in mind the need to apply these parameters consistently in the institutional and functional restructuring of the relevant bodies of the United Nations.

Mr. HIDALGO BASULTO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Today we are considering two documents of fundamental importance to the United Nations and to its future: the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization since his assumption of his office and the document entitled "An Agenda for Peace", submitted by the Secretary-General purusant to the request made to him by the Security Council at its meeting on 31 January 1992.

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

We are particularly grateful to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali for his initiative in making this second text available to the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly; it has already been receiving, because of its implications, the most careful attention of the whole international community, and not only of the small group of countries that requested its preparation.

We also welcome the fact that a substantive debate is taking place this year on the now traditional General Assembly agenda item 10. We believe that a broad and in-depth discussion of the information furnished us by the Secretary-General from year to year with regard to the tasks undertaken by the United Nations and the Organization's prospects, as well as his own perception of the future, should become a sound practice of the General Assembly, and should not be held only when a specific text arouses our interest.

While we shall try to refer so far as possible to both documents, which complement each other to a considerable degree, we will focus primarily on "Agenda for Peace", given its importance to the future role being planned for the United Nations.

As we see it, a series of elements necessarily come together in any analysis of this document. If we disregard them we risk arriving at mistaken or incomplete conclusions, with all the consequences that that would entail for the development of truly democratic procedures within the Organization and for the preservation of its independence as the representative of the plurality of interests that coexist, and must continue to coexist, within it.

The Secretary-General himself, in his historic statement at the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, recently held in Jakarta, Indonesia, underscored aspects of the contemporary

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

international scene that are already setting trends within the United Nations and that are thus inevitably a part of the analysis we are beginning today, aspects that must to a considerable extent guide us to our conclusions.

On that occasion we were reminded by the Secretary-General that

"The temptation to dominate, either world-wide or regionally, remains."

He also alerted us to the fact that that temptation

"threatens the weaker and poorer States, which are still the most numerous in the world."

The thrust of Mr. Boutros-Ghali's statement was to urge the non-aligned countries, the weakest, poorest and most numerous States of the planet, not to give in to defeatism, but, rather, to help the United Nations in the efforts it must make to confront the situation, to speak out and to remain faithful - "unflinchingly faithful," in his inspired words - to the concept of national sovereignty, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the practice of real economic cooperation.

The principles emphasized by the Secretary-General should be strictly observed, without exception and without discrimination of any kind, and mechanisms should be designed to defend the Organization against any temptation to use it as an instrument, either voluntary or involuntary, for violating those principles or exercising policies of domination. We are convinced that that would constitute the best, most complete and most effective agenda for peace we could design within the framework of our international Organization and in defence of the concepts enshrined in the Charter.

In that connection, we must express our concern and unease over the development within the United Nations of certain concepts, practices and

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

trends that flagrantly contradict the principles I have just mentioned. We also note with equal concern that the document we are beginning to consider not only fails to suggest measures to curb those phenomena, but includes concepts and proposes mechanisms that would tend, in practice, to strengthen them.

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

To Cuba, any idea that tends to introduce criteria that would limit State sovereignty, or any sort of conduct that smacks of intervention or interference in the internal affairs of States Members of the Organization, is unacceptable, in whatever guise and under whatever pretext. By the same token, we cannot accept absolute concepts of democracy that are based on models that are foreign to us and that generally correspond to those of the old colonial Powers. In our view, the essence of democracy lies in allowing peoples to exercise self-determination on the basis of their own cultures, their own values, their own traditions, their own historical experience and their own religious beliefs, free of outside attempts, especially on the part of an Organization such as the United Nations, to exercise power and influence over them.

What sort of democracy is it when a small group of countries, taking refuge behind the Organization, arrogate to themselves the almost-boundless power of making war; when they feel entitled to meddle in affairs that rightfully fall under the jurisdiction of other States; when, in clandestine councils where no one knows exactly what is happening, they impose their own interests, picking and choosing which matters they will act on and which ones they will simply ignore; when they are constantly trying to augment that power by assuming functions not their own, interpreting the Charter at their whim and intervening in activities within the exclusive domain, either of States themselves or of other bodies of this institution?

Against that backdrop, if we allow the advancement of ideas that tend to grant even more power to the powerful, if we help them in their endeavour to pursue a policy of domination by manipulating our Organization, will we not, by acts of commission or omission, be making it easier, to violate the

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

principles to which the Secretary-General referred and which should be gaining in sanctity as the cornerstone of all our actions in this unstable, unipolar world? Did the Secretary-General himself not remind us in Jakarta that in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, the United Nations would never interfere in the internal affairs of a State, either under the cover of preventive diplomacy or for the sake of humanitarian action? Would the acceptance of some of the proposed mechanisms not be a call to undermine the position of the Secretary-General, as expounded in an address to more than 108 Members of the Organization, when in fact we should all be supporting him so that he can fulfil that solemn promise that he made to the non-aligned countries?

If we really want our Organization to play the role for which it was conceived, expressed with the utmost clarity in the purposes and principles that make up the very basis of the Charter, we have no choice but to create a genuine climate of confidence in the United Nations. In no way can that be achieved through the random and unrestricted application of the operational mechanisms proposed in the document entitled "An Agenda for Peace". In our view, at least, that is not the way to gain the confidence of the poorest, weakest and most numerous States in the world.

If we really want democracy, confidence and a community of interests to prevail in the United Nations, for the attainment of the peace and security to which we all aspire, then instead of giving more power to the powerful by increasing the Security Council's exercise of its powers, which would inevitably result from the application of the mechanisms proposed in that document, we should, on the contrary, radically reform the Council, prevent it from assuming functions that are not within its mandate, as it does by

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

interfering in the internal affairs of States. We should redefine the conditions of permanent membership, do away with the antidemocratic and antiquated privilege of veto, limit the uses and abuses of Chapter VII of the Charter and give the Council a membership, structure and operational procedures that are in line with the aspirations of the majority of nations represented in this Hall and that reflect the objective changes that have taken place on the international scene since the founding of our Organization almost 50 years ago.

In paragraph 169 of his report, the Secretary-General points out that

> "Democracy within the family of nations means the application of its principles within the world Organization itself." (A/47/1, para. 169)

He then goes on to say,

> "Preserving the moral authority of the United Nations requires the fullest consultation, participation and engagement of all States, large and small, in the work of the United Nations." (ibid.)

Viewed in this framework, the document entitled "An Agenda for Peace" lacks a clear, appropriate and consistent assessment of the responsibilities of the General Assembly and its obligations vis-à-vis the Security Council. In short, it should not be forgotten that the Council acts, or at least it should act, according to the Charter, on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations, to which it is answerable. Therefore, it is the General Assembly - the only United Nations organ in which we are all represented - that must bear responsibility for discharging the tasks of effectively supervising the work of the Council, preventing abuses of power and hegemonic tendencies within it and drawing up the necessary recommendations so that that body's functioning will be more democratic and more transparent.

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

We are pleased that in the introduction to his report the Secretary-General reaffirms that his fundamental priority is the full application of the principles of democracy between nations and within our Organization. That statement encourages us and gives us hope that in the not-too-distant future Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali will propose concrete measures to turn that laudable aspiration from words into deeds.

We cannot fail to note that while the report of the Secretary-General does attach due importance to the work of the United Nations in connection with international economic cooperation for development, whether or not we are in agreement with all the elements included therein, that dimension is, for all practical purposes, absent from the document entitled "An Agenda for Peace". Lest we forget, the revitalization of a strategy for the comprehensive development of the third world and the eradication of poverty, illiteracy and poor sanitary conditions, to mention just a few of the problems tragically afflicting the countries of the South, should be at the very centre of United Nations attention. There can be no peace in the world until the international economic system is substantively altered for the sake of the economic and social advancement of the underdeveloped countries.

But in order to achieve that end, the structures of the United Nations must operate effectively, not only at the level of technical or humanitarian assistance but also in the very planning and implementation of a global strategy for sustainable development based on justice and equity.

It is essential to strengthen the functions of the General Assembly and its democratic machinery and not yield to the ideas of some who, on the contrary, aim to weaken the powers of this principal organ in that sphere, or to the designs of others whose intention it is to do away totally with role of

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

our Organization in the field of economic and social development. To allow this would be to contradict the very words of the Secretary-General, who notes in paragraph 57 of his report,

> "...the United Nations as an institution is uniquely placed to press for global solutions to global problems in the economic field whether they pertain to aid, trade, technology transfer, commodity prices or debt relief." (A/47/1, para. 57)

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

Not to resolve in the short term the development problems affecting the third world, however hard we work towards eliminating the unfortunate problems that occur - and unfortunately they will continue to occur - in different areas of the South, would be tantamount to contradicting the conviction expressed by the Secretary-General himself in Jakarta, to the effect that

> "As long as underdevelopment persists, with its long train of frustration and violence, none of our victories, however remarkable, will be assured for any length of time."

It is obvious that the United Nations Secretariat, with its experience and its efficiency, must play a role of a far-reaching nature in any effort to strengthen the Organization and to facilitate the task of each one of its organs in carrying out the functions for which it was conceived. We believe that in this framework, geographical distribution within the Secretariat must be inspired by democratic ideas akin to those that should inspire the rest of our Organization. It is not and would not be acceptable for Secretariat posts, including higher posts, to be preassigned to persons of a determined nationality, however powerful their countries of origin may be. Hence we must warmly welcome paragraph 42 of the report of the Secretary-General, in which we are told that there is an intention to avoid the politicization of the Secretariat and to resist pressures from outside that favour a few at the expense of the majority. Mr. Boutros-Ghali can rely on Cuba's complete support in this undertaking, and we hope that the changes that take place in the future in the organizational chart, including the higher posts, will be a reflection of that resolve.

The document "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) proposes to us a series of concrete ideas that would lead to operational mechanisms that require at least

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

some preliminary comment. Suffice it to say that like most of the States Members of our Organization, we are encouraged by the proposal to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to avoid threats to international peace and security. None the less, we do note with concern how some of the concepts pervading the report, its structure and important omissions in the description of the operational mechanisms suggested seem to reflect a lack of certain cardinal principles that should inevitably govern our work.

I should like to refer by way of example to the subject of preventive diplomacy, where the principles of national sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs must be fully respected, just as the principle of prior request and consent of a State to which it is planned that a fact-finding mission be sent must be respected.

Along the same lines, and also by way of example, we feel that the concept of preventive diplomacy which is mentioned in the document is not reflected clearly enough for all of its implications to be fully understood. Everything would seem to indicate that reference is being made to problems that are exclusively national - in other words, internal - over which, according to the Charter, the Organization would not have jurisdiction, and also to the initiation of operations in the course of which it would be easy to violate the sovereignty of a State. The same applies to the list of situations that might constitute a threat to the peace, whose length and degree of generality could lead to interpretations that are potentially harmful to the real application of the above-mentioned principles.

Is it our intention to have the Organization and its structures devote their best efforts to our monitoring each other?

(Mr. Hidalgo Basulto, Cuba)

Likewise, paragraph 44, on the "peace-enforcement units", also contains elements that are of concern as far as preservation of the sovereignty and integrity of States Members of our Organization is concerned; and paragraph 59, which refers to

"support for the transformation of deficient national structures and capabilities, and for the strengthening of new democratic institutions",

would seem to be aimed at imposing upon sovereign countries pre-determined models arbitrarily defined, such as the ones to which we have already referred.

All of this, as we see it, shows that the document "An Agenda for Peace" requires profound study and a much more detailed debate than the one we are conducting now or that we are able to conduct now, and that it is necessary for us to devise ways of promoting that discussion and of determining what we are all prepared to accept and what, because of its implications, we should reject. We support the proposal for the establishment of a working group of the General Assembly devoted to this task.

I should like, finally, to thank the Secretary-General for introducing a document which, although it does not necessarily command general support on each and every one of its aspects, does have the great merit of compelling us all to think about the future of our Organization under the new conditions of our world today, and which was certainly prepared with the commendable intention of strengthening the United Nations at a time when, in spite of all our efforts, dangers still outweigh hopes.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

The Nordic countries welcome the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277). We have studied it with appreciation. The report

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

deals with crucial issues of principle and policy that merit a thorough discussion by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other relevant United Nations forums.

In the document "Shaping the Peace: The United Nations in the 1990s" of 23 October 1991 (A/46/591), the Nordic countries have put forward proposals on possible elements for an integrated United Nations approach to peace-making, peace-keeping and, as a last resort, enforcement action.

In a message to the Summit Meeting of the Security Council, "The Reykjavik Statement on the United Nations" of 22 January 1992 (S/23457, annex), we have further elaborated on how to improve the capability of the United Nations in these areas. Moreover, Nordic proposals have been presented in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and on other occasions.

A strong United Nations is our best hope for coping with the conflicts emerging in the post-cold-war era. Ethnic conflicts, situations of grave implications in humanitarian terms, massive violations of human rights, threatening environmental disasters and economic and social injustices call for urgent action. Our foremost task must be to identify ways and means of dealing effectively with these challenges.

"The end of the cold war has provided an unprecedented opportunity to strengthen the United Nations.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

In the new international climate of cooperation, the General Assembly can reaffirm its responsibility as an authoritative forum for discussion and action on international issues, and the Security Council has begun to fulfil more effectively its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We welcome the strengthened role of the Security Council. It is important that the decisions of the Security Council enjoy wide support from Member States. This requires close cooperation between members of the Security Council and other Members of the United Nations.

In the view of the Nordic countries, one of the messages in "An Agenda for Peace" can be found on the conceptual level. Building on an emerging international consensus and on the statement from the summit meeting of the Security Council, the Secretary-General introduces a broadened security concept. Security can no longer be seen only in a military perspective. Other sources of instability in the economic, social, humanitarian and ecological fields are increasingly considered threats to international peace and security.

The Nordic countries endorse the Secretary-General's views in this regard. Lasting peace and security can be achieved when the necessary economic, social and environmental conditions are in place, when human rights are respected and the principles of democracy are applied.

Post-conflict peace-building and long-term economic and social development can thus not be separated from security issues. As underlined in the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization, an integrated approach is required. A stronger United Nations in the field of international peace and security must go hand in hand with reformed and revitalized structures in the areas of economic and social development.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

We cannot avoid the difficult, but necessary, discussion on how to strike a balance between the principle of national sovereignty and the need for collective international action to deal with threatening situations, while acting within the United Nations Charter. Otherwise, the United Nations may not be able effectively to promote solutions to conflicts that are internal in a geographical sense but may have far-reaching international ramifications.

The Nordic countries strongly support the Secretary-General's view that preventive diplomacy is the most desirable and efficient way to defuse tensions or contain conflicts. The Secretary-General should be provided with the necessary resources to carry out effectively his role under Article 99 of the Charter.

Access to adequate, accurate and timely information and analysis is of fundamental importance for the Secretary-General, the General Assembly and the Security Council when considering preventive action.

We believe that the Organization should rationalize and enhance its capability to collect, analyse and disseminate information on situations that might develop into conflicts. This capability should encompass early warning, including assessment of global trends. Information-sharing by Member States as well as non-governmental organizations to the United Nations can provide valuable input. An operative link must be established between the collection and analysis of information and subsequent action by relevant United Nations bodies.

The Nordic countries welcome the dispatch of fact-finding missions by the Secretary-General to areas of potential or actual conflict and would like to see this practice developed and expanded.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

Information on levels of armaments, conventional as well as weapons of mass destruction, and on transfers of arms-related technology is crucial for early warning and thus for preventive action. The Nordic countries welcome the establishment of the Register of Conventional Arms.

We furthermore encourage the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General to continue to take appropriate action to prevent the proliferation of weapons - especially weapons of mass destruction - to areas of potential or actual conflict. The Security Council should consider taking a greater role in ensuring compliance with disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation instruments.

Access to information, not least for early-warning purposes, may be enhanced by establishing an appropriate system for information-sharing between regional arrangements and organizations and the United Nations. This should include information-sharing on confidence-building measures.

The Nordic countries see a promising potential for increased cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations also in other areas, such as peacemaking and peace-keeping.

At the summit meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Helsinki, the CSCE explicitly pronounced itself as a regional organization as defined in the United Nations Charter. The basis for strengthening the coordination and cooperation between the CSCE and the United Nations has thus been laid in the areas I have mentioned.

The Nordic countries agree with the Secretary-General that preventive deployment of peace-keeping forces as a deterrent to potential armed conflict should be considered. Specific situations may arise when monitors or a peace-keeping force might be deployed for preventive purposes at the request of only one of the parties concerned, on that party's side of a border.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

The setting up of demilitarized zones can also, as proposed by the Secretary-General, be a useful preventive measure.

Peacemaking activities, which may include good offices, mediation, conciliation and other diplomatic efforts, should play an increasingly important role in the settlement of disputes. However, to be effective, these activities must be provided with the necessary political support and adequate resources.

In the view of the Nordic countries, the peacemaking and peace-keeping activities of the United Nations are interdependent. Coordination should be improved and enhanced among the relevant bodies of the United Nations system in these areas.

Traditional peacemaking activities may in many cases be supplemented by advisory services and training to facilitate peaceful settlements of disputes and a transition to democracy. Contributions by Member States to the establishment of a stand-by pool of qualified personnel in the fields of electoral assistance, human rights and civilian administration would be helpful in this regard.

An evaluation mechanism should be developed within the Secretariat with the purpose of systematically collecting, analysing and retaining experience gained from peacemaking activities, and this could prove useful in other similar situations.

As pointed out in "An Agenda for Peace", the International Court of Justice remains an underused resource for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Parties to a dispute should use the Court more frequently. Member States should accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the court. Increased use should be made of the possibility to request the advisory opinion of the Court

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

on legal issues in order to prevent or defuse a conflict. The Nordic countries fully endorse the recommendation of the Secretary-General to support the Trust Fund established to assist countries who cannot afford the cost of bringing a dispute to the Court.

The Security Council should consider the use of warnings and sanctions against parties that are patently unwilling to solve peacefully conflicts that threaten international peace and security. To improve the readiness to act in this regard, the Security Council might consider initiating a study on the effectiveness and management of different types of sanctions. Special consideration should be given to the problem of how better to alleviate the burden on third countries that are confronted with special economic problems as a result of such sanctions.

In "An Agenda for Peace" the Secretary-General brings up the question of a special arrangement between Member States and the United Nations in order to make armed forces available to the United Nations on a permanent basis. He furthermore introduces the new concept of peace-enforcement units.

The possibilities of the Charter in this regard have not yet been fully explored. The ideas of the Secretary-General are very important and merit serious consideration. We are prepared to participate in a discussion aiming at the broadest possible agreement.

The Nordic countries welcome the innovative approach and flexibility demonstrated by the Secretary-General and the Security Council in mounting increasingly complex and diverse United Nations operations when dealing with threats to international peace and security. However, in order to cope with the ever-increasing demands, it is essential that the peace-keeping operations be put on a sound and secure financial basis through assessed contributions.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

Member States must pay their assessed contributions for peace-keeping activities in full and on time. The overall funding of the Organization must rest on the collective responsibility of the entire membership. It is also important that troop-contributing countries be guaranteed that the United Nations will honour its obligations to make adequate and timely reimbursements to them. One of the priority tasks of the General Assembly at this session is to decide to establish a system for funding the initial phase of peace-keeping operations.

The Nordic countries would like to reiterate their strong support for the establishment of a reserve fund to secure the financing of the start-up phase of peace-keeping operations. Both the Secretary-General and his predecessor have put special emphasis on this idea.

Adequate organizational structures must also be created to deal with the new challenges in peace-keeping. The organization and operation of United Nations peace-keeping must be streamlined as much as possible. An integrated organizational and command structure would enhance effectiveness and coordination. On matters such as personnel, equipment, logistics and training the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations provides a forum for in-depth discussions. The Nordic countries will continue to present concrete proposals in that Committee and to participate actively in its work. We have noted with appreciation the idea, put forward by the President of the United States in the general debate, of holding a special meeting of the Security Council to discuss various practical aspects of peace-keeping operations.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

The Nordic countries participate in practically all United Nations peace-keeping operations. We reiterate our offer to share our experience by providing advice and training to countries which are now preparing for peace-keeping missions.

Successful peacemaking and peace-keeping efforts frequently need to be followed by post-conflict peace-building measures. Peace must be consolidated; support must be given to new democratic structures; and a sense of confidence and hope for the future must be created in countries previously ravaged by war. These problems are currently being addressed by the United Nations in complex operations in, for example, Cambodia, El Salvador, Angola and Mozambique. We support such a comprehensive approach to peace-building. We are prepared to consider how best to contribute to reconstruction projects, de-mining, the repatriation of refugees, training of civilian police or other activities within the framework of peace-building.

To conclude, let me summarize the views of the Nordic countries in three points:

First, the Nordic countries strongly support the Secretary-General's approach in "An Agenda for Peace". That document is very timely and contains several proposals that should be implemented without delay.

Secondly, decisive measures should be taken to close the gap between the increasing and ever more complex demands on the Organization and its present capabilities and resources. Several proposals of the Secretary-General address this problem. They should be followed up.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

Thirdly, immediate action should be taken to strengthen the United Nations capability for preventive diplomacy and to establish a reserve fund to secure the financing of the start-up phase of peace-keeping operations.

We are prepared to take part in a comprehensive consideration of the ideas and proposals in the Secretary-General's report. The aim should be to reach consensus on a series of proposals that could be implemented without delay. The establishment of an open-ended working-group of the Assembly could be a mechanism for achieving this goal. Given the large number of proposals and the complexity of the issues, such a procedure would benefit from the active involvement of the relevant organs of the General Assembly in elaborating the proposals, as suggested by the European Community.

We must not miss this opportunity to contribute to a stronger United Nations. To quote the Secretary-General's words in "An Agenda for Peace",

> "Now is the time for its nations and peoples, and the men and women who serve it, to seize the moment for the sake of the future." (A/47/277, para. 86)

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): Our discussion today is based on the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, document A/47/1 of 11 September 1992, and the report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the summit meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992, document A/47/277 of 17 June 1992. I must congratulate the Secretary-General on both documents; both are constructive, forward-looking and action-oriented. I must congratulate those concerned on the innovative step of having the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Organization discussed in plenary meeting. I hope this practice will continue in the future. The two reports reinforce each other and seek to promote the United Nations and its activities in a proactive light, taking on the challenges ahead.

As a third-world country, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and a member of the Group of 77, Malaysia obviously places considerable trust and expectation in the United Nations, even if we were not around in 1945 to be responsible for the manner of its inception. Having inherited a United Nations made very much in the image of a few - specifically the victorious Powers - we seek every opportunity now to effect change in the Organization. We believe that we have now reached such a moment, a point in time where reasonable hopes can be expected from changes in the United Nations. We realize that despite dramatic and qualitative developments affecting the Organization and the international scene, change within the United Nations and in relations among States conducted within the United Nations system cannot happen overnight; neither can it be revolutionary. Change will have to be a process conditioned by time and many other factors and, as the Secretary-General said in his report on the work of the Organization, it will be neither easy nor risk free. But one thing is certain: there must be change. We must not make any irreversible mistake that will make posterity condemn us for not taking advantage of a historic opportunity.

The end of the cold war is generally accepted as having been a turning point in the affairs of the world: after 45 years, countries do not have to

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

live under the shadow or threat of being vassals of one so-called super-Power or the other. We are now determined that there will never be a recurrence of the situation where the world is divided into two blocs and where that conflict subsumes all other important issues, such as the dire need for development in the South. Malaysia does not agree that it was communism that mired the world for 45 years; more accurately, it was the grand ambition of the super-Powers that made the entire globe the cockpit of its rivalry.

There is a lot of ground to be made up after the neglect of those years. This is applicable to the United Nations itself as an organization. The report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization clearly indicates the Secretary-General's readiness to undertake the necessary changes in the Organization. We wish the Secretary-General and his team well. At the same time, we urge that the widest consultations be attempted in the process. The Secretary-General will be exposed to many views, some more pervasive than others. The end of the cold war and the changing times do not mean the end of the pursuit of primacy of positions and ideas. Those that have profited from the United Nations as structured in 1945 will fight rearguard actions to perpetuate their advantages. In the circumstances, it is incumbent on the third world, through the Non-Aligned Movement or the Group of 77, or individually, to hold strong to their collective views.

The bottom line is that the United Nations of the future must clearly be on the side of the world's majority. It must be attentive and caring to the problems of that majority. Any change in the United Nations through restructuring or revitalization must result in maximizing the opportunity for

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

the South and the third world to place their problems before the Organization for attention and redress. It is in that context that we in the South must make our views known as much as possible. We must take the Secretary-General at his word; we must have faith in his invitation to dialogue. We must not let the few continue to influence the United Nations. We should set targets - perhaps by 1995 - for discernable changes within the United Nations to be firmly set in train.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

In the report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General singled out the areas the United Nations would concentrate on. These are: global partnership for development; managing crises and peaceful settlements; and humanitarian assistance and democratization. In the other document, also known as "An Agenda for Peace", the Secretary-General elaborated on the role of the Security Council and the role of the Secretary-General in pursuit of peace and security. It is clear that for all these objectives the United Nations as an institution must be demonstrably efficient and motivated as well as clearly represent the majority and the collective aspirations of its membership.

In his first year of office the Secretary-General has undertaken many bold changes which have been supported by us. He has put in motion efforts to make the Secretariat a viable force for undertaking actions related to policy-setting, to research and analysis and to financing, coordinating and executing operational activities. Some countries have in the past felt that the Secretariat had gone amiss on some of these priorities, and they will now expect better performance in the years ahead.

In the second phase of the restructuring to be undertaken by the Secretary-General, we would like to see more tangible progress. The time of interdepartmental and interagency disputes and jockeying for position must be a chapter of the past. We expect the Secretary-General, through an invigorated Administrative Committee on Coordination, to ensure that this is so.

In the context of the United Nations as a vehicle to effect a global partnership for development, the record of the past is not a meritorious one. Even in the present context, many countries like Malaysia are concerned that

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

the United Nations has diverted time and energy more to problems related to peace and security than to the needs of the South. The report of the Secretary-General itself states that political progress and economic development are inseparable, that both are equally important and that they must be pursued simultaneously. In the new climate of international relations we must not miss the opportunity to develop at the United Nations the necessary international consensus and policy instruments to promote this integrated approach. The 45 years of neglect of the South due to the cold war must be made up very quickly, and we in the South are looking to the United Nations for this.

The last four decades have seen the marginalization of the United Nations itself, which on policies and factors affecting the condition and well-being of the South, has been overtaken by bodies such as Bretton Woods. It will be an impossible task to bring these issues completely back to the United Nations, but there must now be a clear linkage between what happens at Bretton Woods and what would be attempted at the United Nations. The world's majority as reposed in the United Nations must have a say in the critical decisions taken at bodies such as Bretton Woods and the Group of 7. The decisions of Bretton Woods can no longer be allowed to be taken in isolation or out of step with the collective needs expressed at the United Nations.

One of the dramatic achievements of the last two years has been the preparations and final decisions of the Rio Summit, particularly the consensus to establish the commission on sustainable development. Here would lie a strong prospect of an international consensus to address questions on development of the South. The Commission would also provide a needed opportunity to interface the affairs of Bretton Woods with deliberations at

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

the United Nations. The world social summit also promises to further the international consensus for development and the consolidation of States. Malaysia is encouraged by the Secretary-General's commitment to enhance the renewal of global partnership and development as reflected in his report. We believe that he has a special and catalytic role to play to bring about a fresh North-South dialogue and cooperation. The Secretary-General has been widely acclaimed for his "Agenda for Peace". Now we would appeal to him for an "agenda for development" to enhance international development cooperation.

The report on the organization considered extensively United Nations activities in the context of conflict management and humanitarian assistance. This part links up to the Secretary-General's "Agenda for Peace". It is a fact that the United Nations has regained considerable credibility on the basis of successful efforts in defusing tensions and conflicts in the last few years. The United Nations peace-keeping operations stand out as an outstanding example of what the United Nations is capable of doing.

In the "Agenda for Peace" the Secretary-General focused on the question of preventive diplomacy. The successful application of preventive diplomacy will make unnecessary extensive peace-keeping bogged down interminably and plagued by financial constraints. Malaysia is convinced that the future credibility and effectiveness of the concept of collective security and the United Nations role in the maintenance of international peace and security require greater use of the mechanism for preventive diplomacy. This will be possible if there is strong support for the Secretary-General and the Security Council to undertake pro-active actions, early actions to evaluate conflict situations and undertake decisive moves to prevent the outbreak of open conflicts. But Member States will give their support only if there is

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

sufficient confidence and trust especially in the actions of the Security Council, something which has to be acquired over time.

The Malaysian delegation also wishes to see that the United Nations, as an international organization committed to peace and development, have full recourse to the collective efforts and resources under the provision of Chapter VI of the Charter on pacific settlement of disputes, raised by the Secretary-General in paragraph 34 of his report. The pacific settlement of disputes, no matter how difficult to achieve, would produce lasting results in terms of ensuring durable peace and security. Malaysia does not hesitate over the use of force as a collective action. We have supported such actions in the past and have insisted that force be applied in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

My delegation fully endorses the Secretary-General's view that

> "The principles of the Charter must be applied consistently, not selectively, for if the perception should be of the latter, trust will wane and with it the moral authority which is the greatest and most unique quality of that instrument." (A/47/277, para. 82)

The United Nations effectiveness in preventing and settling conflicts, and preserving international peace is dependent on the credibility of its decisions and the degree of consistency in the application of the principles of the Charter. In the spirit of the Charter and the interests of Member States, there has to be harmonization in the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of peace and security. We must not have a situation where the views of the general membership of the United Nations are ignored and the Council chooses to apply principles only when it suits the interests and convenience of certain members.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

We are not happy over the absence of a balanced, mutually reinforcing relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly. There should be a greater role for the General Assembly and more regular and closer consultations between the general membership and the Security Council in matters relating to peace and security. In this regard, the General Assembly should assert its role in upholding the Charter and ensure that the expanding activities of the Security Council do not go beyond its mandate or run counter to the provisions of the Charter, particularly Article 2 (7) concerning the cardinal rule on non-interference in the domestic affairs of Member States. The United Nations exists on the basis of sovereign States, clearly embodied and reflected in the business conducted at the General Assembly. There cannot be any attrition of sovereignty, either by actions of the Security Council or even in peace-keeping and similar actions. While traditional concepts are undergoing change, given the asymetry of the power equation and an unequal world, sovereignty must continue to be upheld.

We endorse the call by the Secretary-General for closer support between the United Nations and the regional organizations. However, this would require further efforts at the regional levels to enable the regional organizations to play a supportive role to the United Nations in areas of confidence-building, peaceful resolutions of conflicts, peacemaking and peace-keeping.

Above all, the current situation underlines the need for the reform and restructuring of the Security Council so that its membership should be expanded to reflect better the general membership of the United Nations, which has increased to 179 countries, and so that there is transparency, accountability and democratization in the work of the Council. The veto power

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

given to the Permanent Five at the time of the establishment of the United Nations has now become highly suspect. More and more countries, both from the South and North, urged the reform and restructuring of the Council at the current general debate. Clearly, the time for change is now and the General Assembly should, before the end of the forty-seventh session, establish a working group to undertake a study of the reform and restructuring of the Council and submit its report to the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly though actual results may have to await more time. In our estimation, given the increased workload and the expanded role being visualized for the Security Council in the Secretary-General's "Agenda for Peace", we in Malaysia do not believe that the present Security Council as constituted and structured can be the viable vehicle for those objectives.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

My delegation notes with interest the Secretary-General's various proposals on the question of the financing of the United Nations. Secure financing of the various United Nations peace-keeping operations is the collective responsibility of all States, and there must be prompt payments. The persistent problem of late payments and the accumulation of large arrears undermines the United Nations ability to perform its peace-keeping and peacemaking functions.

The Secretary-General's report also points out the dramatic increase in the workload and activities of the Security Council. While the increased activities of the Security Council, on the one hand, underline the importance of the United Nations role in the maintenance of peace and security, it is becoming a serious cause for concern that the end of the cold war and the collapse of the communist bloc have unleashed nationalist conflicts and ethnic strife that are over-stretching the capacity of the United Nations. The $2.7 billion cost of current peace-keeping operations is two-and-a-half times the budget of the entire Organization. The number of peace-keeping forces in the field has almost quadrupled, from 11,500 in January 1992 to 44,000 in mid-1992. The effect of all this is not only that it has placed a severe strain it has brought on the capacities of the Organization, but in particular that it is becoming a serious test case of the concept of United Nations collective security at a time when so much is expected of the United Nations. Malaysia is particularly concerned that such a situation could, in the name of expedience, encourage selective and double standards in addressing threats to international peace and security.

The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina is one example of where the financial crisis, in a way, has been the reason for inadequate United Nations action and has set a bad precedent, in the case of resolution 770 (1992), where only

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

countries that can afford to make their own military contributions to the United Nations Protection Force to ensure the safety of humanitarian efforts can participate. If this is allowed to continue, the United Nations will in fact be encouraging peace-keeping operations by the few and moving away from the accepted practice of having as broad-based a representation as possible.

There are several proposals in the Secretary-General's report on peace-keeping that were considered in the meeting of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations earlier this year and incorporated in the conclusion of that Committee's report in document A/47/235. The proposals are practical ones, relating to more efficient logistical support for peace-keeping operations and a more reliable and sustained availability of equipment. There are also specific proposals on training and the availability of personnel. In his report, the Secretary-General proposed the establishment of a peace-keeping fund as a start-up cost for authorized peace-keeping operations. Malaysia regards these proposals as practical suggestions to enhance the United Nations capacity for peace-keeping, and we believe that these proposals deserve strong support from Member States.

Malaysia is strongly committed to enhancing the United Nations capacity for preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping and peacemaking. Our delegation has been involved in the work of like-minded countries belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement in considering the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace". My country is contributing military and civilian personnel to many of the United Nations peace-keeping operations around the world. Hence, regard, Malaysia would actively participate in any future follow-up action on the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace". We believe that

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

a working group should be established to identify proposals contained in the Secretary-General's report that command consensus support, so that they could be implemented as a matter of some urgency. At the same time, the working group could deliberate further on those ideas that require further study and work towards consensus-building, so that the sum total of their work would go towards enhancing the United Nations capacity for and use of preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping and peacemaking.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.